UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT BUTHE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.		Case 2:24-cv-00325-DC-AC Document	10 Filed 03/21/25	Page 1 of 2	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT BUNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, v. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. #### Part	1				
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.					
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.					
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	4				
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	5				
By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	6				
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. #### Plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	7				
RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. Mill M	8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
RANDALL POPE, Plaintiff, V. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. Mill M	9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
Plaintiff, v. L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	10				
ORDER AND FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	11	RANDALL POPE,	No. 2:24-cv-0325 A	AC P	
L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	12	Plaintiff,			
L. KISS, Defendants. By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	13	V.	ORDER AND FINE	OINGS &	
By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. 28 ////	14	L. KISS,	RECOMMENDATI	<u>ONS</u>	
By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.	15	Defendants.			
claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	16				
cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Id. at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	17	By order filed February 4, 2025, the complaint was screened and found to not state a			
at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	18	claim for relief. ECF No. 8. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file an amended complaint and			
responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	19	cautioned that failure to do so would result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. <u>Id.</u>			
served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	20	at 5. Thirty days have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise			
182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	21	responded to the court's order. The file further reflects that the screening order, which was			
plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing in propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	22	served on plaintiff's address of record, was returned by the postal service. Pursuant to Local Rule			
propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	23	182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective. It appears that			
the court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address. ////	24				
27 current address. 28 ////	25	propria persona inform the court of any address change. More than thirty days have passed since			
28 ////	26				
	28				

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall randomly assign a United States District Judge to this action IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED that the complaint be dismissed for failure to state a claim for the reasons set forth in the February 4, 2025 Screening Order (ECF No. 8) and for failure to prosecute. See L.R. 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; L.R. 183(b). These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). DATED: March 21, 2025 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Document 10

Filed 03/21/25

Page 2 of 2

Case 2:24-cv-00325-DC-AC